

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,728	10/19/2001	Yukari Hashizume	550718-093	7391
27805	7590 09/10/2003			
THOMPSON HINE L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
2000 COURTHOUSE PLAZA, N.E. 10 WEST SECOND STREET			HENDERSON, MARK T	
DAYTON, OF	45402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722 DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003	11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		HASHIZUME, YUKARI					
Office Action Summary	10/037,728 Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Mark T Henderson	3722					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app							
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 J	<u>lune 2003</u> .						
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under a Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayre, 1955 C.D. 11, 4	:03 O.G. 213.					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		minor					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and policing applicant may not request that any objection to the							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		• •					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-					
14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	• •						
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal I	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Faxing of Responses to Office Actions

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9302 (Official) and (703)872-9303 (for After Finals). This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Continued Prosecution Application

- The request filed on June 23, 2003 for a Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR
 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/037,728 is acceptable and a RCE has been established.
 An action on the RCE follows.
- 2. Claims 1 has been amended for further examination.

Art Unit: 3722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmeister (5,301,445) in view of Ashcraft et al (6,045,161).

Hoffmeister discloses in Fig. 1, a binder insert comprising: a transparent plastic bag shaped body (24) with an open upper side (34); a photograph store portion (20) and a memo store portion (22); a store board (12); and wherein a memo paper can be inserted in the memo portion (Col. 1, lines 55-60); and a binding section (18) having holes.

However, Hoffmeister does not disclose: a store board comprising thick paper folded in two and having slits at a predetermined location; a color paper disposed between facing surfaces of the thick paper; and slits in various shapes.

Ashcraft et al discloses in Fig. 1-3, a store board (36) comprising thick paper folded in two (42 and 46) having a set of slits (44, slits which form the tabs) at a predetermined location; a color paper (34) disposed between the thick paper surfaces.

Art Unit: 3722

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hoffmeister's binder insert to include a store board comprising folded thick paper having slits, and a inserted color paper as taught by Ashcraft et al for the purpose of mounting the photographs in a stable position on the store board.

In regards to Claim 1, it is understood that the process of making a store board can be made by a myriad of processes and that patentability is based solely on the product (see MPEP 2113, In re Morosi and Exparte Gray). Therefore, dividing the portions can be done by any desirable method.

In regards to Claims 3 and 11, the slits being used to insert corner of a photograph and a color paper therebetween, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Therefore, the slits are capable of being used to hold a photograph and a color paper therebetween.

In regards to Claims 4, 5, 7-10, and 13-16, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the slits of whatever form or shape was desired or

Art Unit: 3722

expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

In regards to Claims 10 and 16, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the slits at any desirable location, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

In regards to Claims 6 and 12, matters related to the choice of ornamentation producing no mechanical effect or advantage considered to constitute the invention are considered obvious and do not impart patentability, *In re Seid* 73 USPQ 431. Therefore, any desirable colored paper can be inserted in the slots.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3722

Prior Art References

The prior art references listed in the attached PTO-892, but not used in a rejection of the

claims, are cited for (their/its) structure. Matteau et al, Ashcraft et al ('443), Townsend et al,

Mirza, Bradley et al, Williams, JP-655889, JP-21498, Parobek, and Ruebens disclose similar

inserts.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can

be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by

telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on

(703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general

nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700

receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

MTH

August 31, 2003

A. L. WELLINGTON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700